

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Final Official Action of June 30, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration re respectfully requested. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. The courtesy of the examiner in carefully indicating what portions of the proposed combination of references responded to the previous claims, a so-called “mapping” exercise, is acknowledged with appreciation.

Entry of this amendment is in order because it places this application in condition for allowance by emphasizing a feature shown in original Fig. 2. That is, the driving coil 7 and the driving magnet 4 are disposed substantially within a quadrant circumference of the lens 15. A paragraph is added to the specification to support this language *in haec verba*, but it does not, at least as claimed, constitute new matter. The newly-claimed structural features are clearly shown in Fig. 2. In addition, “volume efficiency” is mentioned in the original specification.

Entry of this amendment is apt because it responds on the record to new grounds of rejection first advanced in the Final Action, even though it was urged that the Applicant’s amendment prompted the new grounds of rejection. A response on the record better prepares this application for an appeal, should an appeal become necessary.

Specifically, each of the independent combination claims 1, 11 and 17 is similarly amended to define the structural arrangement shown in cross-section in Fig. 2, without the introduction of new matter.

Neither Wakabayashi nor Sakamoto recognizes this illustrated feature, now claimed. Wakabayashi, in Figs. 1, 7 and 9 relied upon by the examiner, shows magnets disposed in all four quadrants defined by a circumference of the driving lens. Indeed, the examiner properly recognized that Wakabayashi did not contemplate the driving coil and the driving magnet shaped in curved forms, see the top of page 3 of the Final Action.

Driving coil 14 and driving magnet 17 shown in Fig. 1 of Sakamoto were relied upon for the features of curvatures previously claimed. It is clear from Fig. 1 that Sakamoto

illustrates members that are circumferential, occupying the entire circumference of a cross section about an optical axis of the lens. Sakamoto does not contemplate the claimed feature that the driving coil and driving magnet are disposed in a quadrant circumference of the lens.

Thus, even if the combination of Wakabayashi and Sakamoto were somehow proper and motivated as urged in the Final Action, the claimed combination advanced by the Applicant responsive to these new grounds of rejection is not met. Rather, the hypothetical combination would include a driving coil and driving magnet in all four quadrants of the circumference; indeed, nothing in either newly-applied reference suggest the contrary.

Therefore, all claims presently pending are allowable as amended.

Dated: August 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant